

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SCOTT C. SEEHAUSEN,

Defendant and Appellant.

B211557

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. YA069146)

THE COURT:*

Scott C. Seehausen appeals from the judgment entered following a jury trial that resulted in his conviction of count 1, first degree burglary (Pen. Code, § 459)¹ and count 2 grand theft (§ 487, subd. (a).) The jury found true that appellant had been convicted of attempted murder (§§ 664, 187) within the meaning of sections 1170.12, subdivisions (a) through (d) and 667, subdivisions (b) through (i). On July 17, 2007, appellant visited Edward Antablin (Antablin), a diamond dealer, to purchase a diamond from him. Appellant examined one of two diamonds that Antablin had procured for him. While Antablin was distracted, appellant took the second diamond from its box. When Antablin

* BOREN, P. J., DOI TODD, J., CHAVEZ, J.

¹ All further statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise indicated.

later opened that box, the diamond was missing. On July 31, 2007, appellant took that diamond to a jewelry store to be appraised. On August 1, 2007, the jewelry store clerk identified the diamond that Antablin reported stolen as the one he had appraised for appellant. Los Angeles Deputy Sheriff Jeffrey Farmer arrested appellant on August 1, 2007. On August 2, 2007, appellant told Antablin that he had found the diamond in his sock. That same day he paid Antablin \$5,800 in cash and \$100 by check for the diamond.

Appellant was sentenced to a total term of 17 years in state prison as follows: on count 1, the upper term of six years doubled to 12 years, plus five years pursuant to section 667, subdivision (a) prior conviction; on count 2, eight months (one-third the midterm of 24 months), doubled to 16 months, stayed pursuant to section 654. We appointed counsel to represent him on this appeal.

After examination of the record, counsel filed an “Opening Brief” in which no issues were raised.

On March 19, 2009, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues which he wished us to consider. On April 7, 2009, we received an incomprehensible reply from appellant, who signed as “Secured Party Creditor Trustee, All Rights and Defenses Reserved Without Prejudice, Agent for Principal Without Liability, Without Recourse, Priority Claim-Exempt from Levy,” posing questions such as “What appeal?” and “Who is Appellant?”

Appellant has raised no arguable issues.

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.